

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 have been amended and claims 12-22 have been added. Claims 1 and 12 are independent. The specification has been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In claim 1, Applicant submits an amendment redefining the fall prevention member as "connected to the locking member for preventing the child car seat from falling off the stroller body." It is clear that claim 1 does not positively recite the stroller body or the child car seat in combination with the stroller body in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is definite and clear.

Claim 2 has also been amended to recite the fall prevention member "for contacting the front leg" to avoid the stroller body being positively recited.

In claim 4, the claim language has been rewritten as "the locking rod is arranged for contacting the front leg of the stroller body." It is clear that Applicant intends to claim the locking rod rather than claim the locking rod in combination with the stroller body

because the claim language does not positively recite the combination of the locking rod and the stroller body.

In claim 5, Applicant deletes the following sentence, "with sandwiching therebetween an armrest boss part projected from a front end of the armrest," to avoid reciting the pair of levers in combination with the stroller body. In addition, Applicant amends the locking rod as "positionable forward of the front leg" to eliminate the positive claim of the front leg.

In claim 9, "for contacting" has been replaced with "to contact." Such amendment shows that Applicant intends to claim the locking lever instead of the locking lever in combination with the stroller body because there is no such structural claim limitation between the locking body and the stroller body.

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Pursuant to the recommendation in the Office Action, additional claims 12-22 have been added. In claims 12-22, Applicant clearly claims a child stroller, which comprises a stroller body and a child car seat in combination. Accordingly the § 112 rejection set forth does not apply to additional claims 12-22.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Washizuka et al. (USPN 6,695,400).

Claims 1-2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pereo (USPN 6,318,807).

Also, claims 1-2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bapst et al. (USPN 6,409,205).

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) set forth above are respectfully traversed.

The present invention as recited in claim 1 is directed to a child car seat, wherein a combination of elements are recited, including "a fall prevention member connected to the locking member for preventing the child car seat from falling off the stroller body." This aspect of the present invention is disclosed in the specification, at page 8, line 2. However, none of the references relied on by the Examiner disclose this aspect of the present invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are respectfully requested.

Washizuka et al. teaches a child car seat 10 to be mounted on a car seat or on a baby carriage body 45. The child car seat 10 has a body 10a featuring a locking device 30 to lock the child seat body 10a in place. The locking device 30 has a hook 35 for engaging a projection 31 of the baby carriage body 45. The hook 35 releases the projection 31 allowing the child seat body 10a to be detached from the baby carriage body 45 when the locking device 30 turns to a releasing position. This reference, however, neither directly suggests the fall prevention member, which is connected to the locking member, nor mentions any element serving as the fall prevention member.

Therefore the Washizuka et al. reference fails to anticipate independent claim 1 of the present invention.

Perego teaches a frame 11 and child reception member 12 assembly. The reception member 12, which may be a seat or a nacelle, features movable hooking members 21, 23 for engaging with corresponding fixed hooking members 22 on the frame 11. Each of the movable hooking members 21, 23 has a control member 23 and an engagement means 21. The engagement means 21 may move to a release position upon operation of the control member 23. This reference, however, neither directly suggests the fall prevention member, which is connected to the locking member, nor mentions any element serving as the fall prevention member. Therefore the Perego reference fails to anticipate independent claim 1 of the present invention.

Bapst et al. teaches a stroller in combination with a child carrier 30. The stroller has a child carrier mount 518 for mounting the child carrier 30. The child carrier 30 includes a latch 90 disposed on the rear side of the child carrier 30. The latch 90 features a pair of hook members 96a, 96b for engaging with the child carrier mount 518 so that the child carrier 30 may be releasably secured to the stroller. This reference, however, neither directly suggests the fall prevention member, which is connected to the locking member, nor mentions any element serving as the fall prevention member. Therefore the Bapst et al. reference fails to anticipate independent claim 1 of the present invention.

With regard to claims 2 and 5, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable due to their dependence upon allowable independent claim 1, as well as due to the additional recitations in these claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2 and 5 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 3-4 and 6-11 have been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant greatly appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner. As mentioned above, the claims have been amended in order to overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. However, claims 3-4 and 6-11 have not been rewritten in independent form at this time, since it is believed for the above-mentioned reasons that independent claim 1 is directed to allowable subject matter.

**Additional Claims**

Additional claims 12-22 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Additional claims 12-22 are directed to a child stroller, including the combination of a stroller body and a child car seat. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-22 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner.

Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 12-22 are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state-of- the-art, no further comments are deemed necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Paul C. Lewis, Registration No. 43,368 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Docket No. 0051-0227PUS1  
Appl. No. 10/827,436  
Amendment dated November 24, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2004  
Page 15 of 15

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Paul C. Lewis, #43,368

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

PCL/cl